DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 320 SO 021 534

AUTHOR Dorn, Charles M.
TITLE A National Association: Our Growth, Organizational Development and Special Projects.
PUB DATE Mar 91
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Art Education Association (Atlanta, GA, March 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Art Education; Centralization; *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Organizational Change; *Organizational Development; *Organizations (Groups); Political Influences; Social Influences; Teacher Associations; Visual Arts
IDENTIFIERS *National Art Education Association

ABSTRACT

The establishment of a unified voice, the development of a learned society, and the democratization of the National Art Education Association's (NAEA) governance are the three most significant changes that have occurred in the development of the NAEA since its establishment in 1947. During NAEA's foundational years, 1947-1958, many important changes occurred in U.S. education including a power shift in teacher training from teacher colleges to universities and the expansion of teacher education programs and the public school system to meet the challenges of the baby boom. During that time, the NAEA was one of five art education organizations. The demographics and scholarly make-up of the NAEA membership changed due to the expansion of art teacher education programs, and the terminal degree required for teaching college art education programs was raised to the doctorate level. The NAEA reorganized between 1962 and 1970. A constitution drafted in 1964 organized four regional associations and the NAEA into a single national association. Two events influenced this action: President Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society," which resulted in new federal funds for research in education, and the growing militancy of the nation's teachers who were demanding a greater voice in the operation of the nation's schools. The NAEA evolved as a single national voice through its reorganization with a unified membership representing teachers of art through single conferences and publication programs highlighting national standards for the profession. These important changes occurred because of the post-war changes in U.S. education, the vision and steadfast leadership of the NAEA governance, and the loyal support of its membership. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CHARLES M. DORN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 336320

Title

A National Association: Our Growth, Organizational Development and Special Projects

Fellow Forum I

March 21

NAEA Convention
Atlanta, Georgia

Charles M. Dorn, Professor of Art Education
Florida State University

SO 021 534

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

My charge is to talk about the beginnings of the NAEA most especially with regard to the establishment of the office, its early organizational changes and the special ~~the~~ projects attempted in our first decade as a unified association. I am aware of course, that my main credential for dealing with this is my arriving at being in "one of the oldest living categories" which in my case refers to my being the second Executive Secretary, now, executive director, of the NAEA from 1962-1970, John Mahlmann (1972), my successor in that office may have best characterized those early years with a quote from Charles Dicken's Tale of Two Cities.

> It was the best of times, it was the worst of times. It was an age of wisdom, it was an age of foolishness. It was an epoch of belief, it was an epoch of incredulity. It was the season of light, it was the season of darkness. It was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair. We had everything before us. We had nothing before us. p. 3

also

These were in spite of everything, incredibly exciting times for a green, untested relatively unknown mid-west college professor who would come to associate with the likes of such professional heros as Edwin Ziegfield, Howard Conant, Manny Barkan, Jerry Hausman, Irv Kaufman, Edmund Feldman, Edward Mattil and some then relatively unknown youngsters in the business like Eliot Eisner, Laura Chapman, Brent Wilson, Arthur Effland, David Templeton and Guy Hubbard, I was indeed fortunate to be educated by some the nation's best art education thinkers.

In the brief time allotted, I will limit my comments to what I view as those events which inspired the three most significant changes in this stage of the association's development: (1) The establishment of a unified voice, (2) our development as a learned society, and (3) the democratization of the NAEA governance. Two events which I will

not discuss in detail are the 1964 constitution and the regionals which are being dealt with by my colleagues Ivan Johnson and John Michael.

The NAEA Foundational Years 1947 - 1958

Before I do this, however, I think it is most important to understand the political and social climate which was the driving force in the NAEA's foundational years. This was best described by our first President, Edwin Ziegfield (1972), as coming at a time when our country was unwinding from its prodigious efforts in World War II. At a time, according to Ziegfield, when men and women by the millions were returning to civilian life. A time when many Americans were picking up the strands of lives interrupted by the war and for others the building of new lives to replace those that had been unalterably changed. Put in Ziegfield's own words.

> The intensity and magnitude of this post-war effort can only be suggested, but it was an exciting time to be a part of. Life was again asserting itself. In 1945, the United Nations' Charter was signed in San Francisco; in 1946, UNESCO, the cultural arm of the UN, was brought into being. Moves leading to the establishment of the International Society for Education Through Art were to follow shortly. p.8

Change and rebirth, indeed, became the norm in these post-war times and art educators became a part of that rebirth in the formation of the NAEA in 1947 and in the establishment of our national headquarters in 1958. Ralph Beelke (1972), NAEA's first executive secretary from 1958 to 1962 who died in 1978, described our beginnings in the following way.

> The Washington office of NAEA was opened on a sunny day in August, 1958. It didn't matter that it was a sunny day, for the office was a cubby-hole with no windows, in the basement of NEA Education Center. There was space for a desk and chair and two visitor's chairs. A small outer office had room for only a

> secretary's desk. Again, it didn't really matter. The secretary was only half-time; the phone didn't ring much; there was no mail to speak of; and business was slow. A trip to Kutztown, Pennsylvania, to secure all the records and property of the NAEA from Italo de Francesco, first secretary-treasurer, found only a typewriter and one file drawer of papers, mostly records of Council meetings and correspondence of the first ten years. But the papers now had a permanent home, art education had an address and was finally joined with other professional associations in a physical way. The dream of "professionalism" for art education as represented by a national association with a secretariat and a paid staff was finally being realized. p.14

Beelke along with other leaders of the NAEA were well aware of the many important changes occurring in american education including the power shift in the teacher training effort from the teachers colleges and former normal schools to the comprehensive university; the transfer of art education programs from the education schools into schools and colleges of art and the expansion of U.S. teacher education programs and public school systems to meet challenges of the so called baby boom. Although these and other developments radically changed the character of the NAEA membership by 1961, Beelke and the NAEA board were unable to meet these new challenges faced with the reality of the NAEA being only one of five art education organizations governed by five different boards operating under five separate budgets with five independent conference and publication programs.

These new post-war educational developments also inspired changes in both the demographics and the scholarly makeup of NAEA membership. On the college level, one such development was the proliferation of art teacher education programs throughout the nation, and another, the requirement for doctorate as the terminal degree for teaching in

art education programs. As a result, NAEA no longer was strictly an eastern regional institution and its studio centered programs no longer totally met the needs of members who saw new importance in art scholarly study and research.

The Reorganizational Years 1962 - 1970

In 1962, with the exceptions of moving to a little larger space on the third floor of the NEA building and some additional secretarial help, the NAEA office was remarkably similar to the one Beelke describes. We were still five associations - the NAEA and four regionals, Eastern, Western, Southeastern and Pacific. Our membership except for the eastern regional was centralized and members paid their 8 dollar dues with the NAEA being allowed to keep 3 dollars to run the Washington office. Considering the membership at that time was only about three thousand one can readily see the NAEA had to generate a good deal of additional income in order to meet even its payroll. The four regionals were governed by four separate boards, which issued separate publications and conducted regional conventions on the even numbered years. The Western and Eastern Regionals had substantial bank accounts with the NAEA supporting publications mostly through income generalized by its biennial conference on the odd number years or through whatever other revenue it could generate.

The NAEA in 1962, was governed by a council of twenty-one individuals who met to conduct business once a year; on the even years in Washington and on the odd years at its Biennial Convention. Of the twenty-one members, five were supervisors, fifteen were from higher education, seven from Eastern Colleges, two from art schools and one

additional member from the commercial field. Of the college level members, three were from State Universities, and the remaining twelve from teacher colleges, former normal schools or newly named state Universities emphasizing the training of teachers. Todays Board with 3 college members and 8 non-college members stands in stark contrast with the NAEA Counsel of 1962. With regard to the NAEA budget an even greater contrast exists between our 1962 program which cost $39,000.00, and today's budget which stands at a million and a quarter.

During the period 1962-1970, two other events affecting American education in general, also encouraged changes in the NAEA. One was President Johnson's "Great Society" and the other was the growing militancy of the nation's teachers who were demanding a greater voice in the operation of the schools. The primary affect of the "Great Society" was a windfall of new Federal dollars for research and development in education and the major effect of the new teacher militancy was the unionization of the teaching profession and the demand for professional associations to pay more attention to so-called "conditions of work" issues.

The NAEA was most directly affected by the new teacher militancy through the National Education Association's rapid transition from a learned society into the nation's largest teacher's union. Because the NEA's thirty four independent departments decided to remain as learned societies, the NEA evicted the NAEA and its sister departments from its downtown Washington building. This required the NAEA along with the other NEA departments to purchase options on land for the construction of future headquarters

buildings in Reston, Virginia. Although this move helped the departments escape becoming part of the union movement it did not help them to avoid the demands by members who were also members of the NEA for a voice in the leadership and management of the subject discipline associations.

The so called "angry young teacher" movement also affected the NAEA through the new ways schools came to be administered. Union contracts not only dealt with wages, but also with the composition of the teaching day and the amount of time teachers could be required to spend on in-service activities and committee work. Although the effect of these two conditions of work decisions on art education have never been researched, it affected the employment of art educators in at least two ways, one, through the demand for special subject teachers to cover the classroom teachers newly acquired preparation time and two, in meeting the increased costs of those new hires through the paring down of administrative staff, most especially, those at the supervisory level. The most direct effect of these events was to substantially increase the number of art teachers employed in the nation's schools and decrease the number of so-called specialists, art supervisors and art directors especially in the State of California where these individuals were employed mainly to develop curriculum and conduct teacher training activities. California was especially hard hit because classroom teachers in their salary negotiations had to choose between receiving more salary or continue supporting specialists who could no longer require teachers to attend workshops and who in most cases made classroom visits only every other year.

While the NAEA lost those former specialists who could not return to the classroom, the most dramatic impact on membership was felt in the larger Southern, Midwestern, and Eastern cities where the once powerful supervisors could in earlier times require art teachers to attend their state, regional and national meetings. We should never underestimate the importance of such city art directors as Mary Cole of Chicago, Olive Riley of New York, Mary McKibben of Pittsburg, Marion Quin-Dix of Elizabeth, George Horn of Baltimore, Jack Bookbinder of Philadelphia and others who contributed so much to the early growth and leadership of the NAEA.

The Great Society's new found wealth for the support of research in education also had an important effect both on the NAEA and on the profession through the establishment of U.S.O.E.'s Division of Cultural Affairs. Art, music dance and theatre specialists were hired by Cathy Bloom and over one million dollars in new money was made available to the field for research and development. In the early sixties, money was used to support a number of developmental conferences including Howard Conant's 1965, Seminar on Education in the Visual Arts, Ed Mattil's, 1966, Penn State Seminar, Manny Barkan's, 1967, Aesthetic Education Project at Ohio State and Stan Madeja's, 1970, CEMREL Project in St. Louis. The new, young Ph.D. scholars now in the Universities, also benefited from the new money. Ken Beittle at Penn State for his self reflective studies, Dave Ecker at Ohio State for his art appreciation program, R. C. Wilson at Buffalo State for the craft conference, Laymen Jones at Penn State, for student teacher dialogues, Bob Clements at Ball State for culturally deprived students, Jack Morrison at

UCLA for expressive behavior, Ron Silverman at Cal State for disadvantaged youths, Ralph Smith at Illinois for aesthetic education, Norman Rice at Carnegie for fine arts curricula, Leon Frankston at Penn State for art products, Hanna Rose at the Brooklyn Museum for disadvantaged youth, Herb Burgart at R.P.I. for creativity and others to numerous to mention.

The NAEA was also the recipient of Federal funds for several developmental projects including: the Newer Media Project directed by Vince Lanier, the Supervision Project directed by Leslie Bishop, the curriculum and instruction project by Alice Baumgartner, the Belgrade Yugoslavia International Symposium, the behavioral objectives pre-conference seminars and Project Impact, ~~developed by Charles Dorn~~.

The NAEA as a Unified Voice

The 1964 constitutional convention which reorganized the Five Associations into a single National Association and which created a governance structure responsive to the so-called "grass roots" memberships was in away a change whose time had come. During the post war years our membership base had shifted from the East to the Midwest and began to spread throughout the entire U.S. Our newer members were no longer the docile and soft spoken breed of the past, wanting a voice in the affairs of their association and in those professional programs directed at improving the working conditions of the art teachers. As a consequence, the NAEA began the process of becoming a single national voice through its reorganization into one national association, with a unified membership representing teachers of art through a single conference and publications program

publicizing national standards for the profession and promoting the commonly held values of its membership in our communities, states and the nation.

NAEA Growth as a Learned Society

The shift of the teacher education programs from the normal schools to the universities, the requirement for teacher educators to earn the Ph.D. and the availability of research funds for the newly graduated scholars in the field all contributed to the rapid expansion of the art education literature, the creation of Studies in Art Education our journal of issues and research, the Seminar for Research and to attracting such imminent scholars as June McFee, Edward MATTIL, Eliot Eisner and Edmund Feldman to important leadership positions in the governance of the association. Our annual conference changed from a limited number of lectures by a few prominent speakers from outside the field to one offering hundreds of individual sessions selected from more than a thousand proposals submitted by the membership. As a result, our membership today is better educated, more professionally qualified, and better informed of the problems and prospects of the field than ever before.

NAEA Democratization

The associations growth through increased membership and expanded opportunities for individual members to have a voice in its leadership and its professional programs have dramatically changed both the governance of the association and the programs we support. The creation of the States Assembly in the 1964 constitution has given much greater power to our state associations and to the practitioner who teaches art in the school.

Participation in the affairs of the assembly has become the major route for accessing the presidency of the association. Unlike the early years when 2/3 of NAEA Board were college professors and only every few years a state or city supervisor became president, most board members today come from non-college positions and it is now possible for someone like Bob Curtis, a classroom art teacher to be elected as its president.

The NAEA Projects

There were at least six important projects sponsored by the NAEA during this important time period. These included three projects funded by U.S.O.E.'s Arts and Humanities Branch: The Newer Media Project, the Supervision project and the Curriculum and Instruction Project; one other funded by U.S.O.E.'s cooperative research, The Behavioral Objectives Seminar, and two international conferences, one funded with Public Law 480 money and the other the INSEA 19th World Conference funded by the National Endowment for the Arts.

The NAEA's first three federally funded developmental conferences were the 1965 Uses of Newer Media in Art Education Project, directed by Vincent Lanier, the 1966 Conference on Curriculum and Instruction Development in Art Education directed by Alice Baumgarner and the (1965) Seminar for Improving the Effectiveness of Supervisor's in Art Education directed by Leslie Bishop. Both the newer media project and the Curriculum and Instruction Conferences which were held in Washington, D.C., supported the expenses of 40 or 50 members to attend meetings dealing with innovations in school programs. The 1966 Supervision Seminar, which was held in Atlanta, Georgia, supported

the expenses of 35 or 40 state directors of art and school art directors and supervisors to attend a conference directed specifically toward improving the effectiveness of supervisors.

All three of these conferences were included in that category of conferences supported by the Arts and Humanities branch which Hoffa called "revivals", because in his view they failed to generate important changes in the profession. From the NAEA's viewpoint these conferences were however, a resounding success, especially in demonstrating that the newly reorganized NAEA could find financial support for art educators from all over the U.S. to come together to learn new ideas and share with colleagues what were then new developments in the field. The NAEA board and its officers tended to agree more with Cathy Bloom's (1976), view of these conferences when she noted:

> Foremost was the sheer fact of convening so many influential people in the arts and in arts education and a wide range of other fields - around 1,500 people in all - to learn from each other, work together, perhaps think new thoughts. Equally important was the efficacy of the experience, which of course varied from conference to conference, in persuading a fair proportion of these people to start concentrating on national problems and priorities. p.30

NAEA's next project to be funded was the Pre-Conference Educational Research Training Program, for Descriptive Research in Art Education, directed by Gordon Kensler. The purpose of these institutes was to provide members with a workable concept of descriptive research and the fundamental techniques of observation that could be used in arts institutions. The institutes were held for three days prior to each of the four 1970 regional conventions. The participants were expected to acquire skill in: (1) problem definition

and descriptive research, (2) selecting research design for descriptive studies, and (3) the methodology for implementing descriptive study using observation techniques.

These institutes were the NAEA's first attempt to sponsor training institutes for its members. In retrospect, I believe the institutes not only provided our members with important research skills but, they also helped identify and unite those members of the profession who shared a common belief in the importance of descriptive research in art education: While initially some NAEA board members were opposed to sponsoring these institutes most of those who originally opposed them later agreed that the institutes were both successful and ~~were~~ much appreciated by the regional membership.

The NAEA also sponsored two international projects, one the New Directions in Art Education International Symposium, in 1967 and the INSEA World Congress in 1969. The Yugoslavia Symposium was supported by Yugoslavia public law 480 monies. The Symposium which was held in Belgrade and was co-hosted by the Yugoslavian INSEA organization supported papers by 30 speakers from the U.S., Canada and from Eastern and Western Europe. What was unique about the congress was the opportunities provided for a beginning dialogue between Western art educators and their colleagues from the then so called eastern block countries of East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

The NAEA's second sponsored international meeting was made possible by a grant from Roger Stevens of the National Endowment for the arts. The funds were used to support the 19th INSEA congress in New York City, August 7-13, 1969. The program was

developed by Edwin Ziegfeld, NAEA past president who was at that time also chairman of the department of Art and Education Teachers College Columbia.

The congress attracted nearly a thousand participants from the U.S. and throughout the world to discuss the theme Education through art: Humanism in a Technological Age. The conference report contained 25 papers from art education scholars in the U.S. Japan, Australia, Canada, England, France, India, Italy the Netherlands, Nigeria, the Philippines, Poland, Scotland, the West Indies, Wales, West Germany and Yugoslavia.

The NAEA as People

Would time permit, much more could be said about these events and other projects that changed the character of the nation's educational systems and influenced the NAEA's unification, professionalization and democratization efforts. In spite of such time constraints, however, I would be remiss to end this at a point where the listener may be left with the impression that these events by themselves were solely responsible for the changes in the NAEA.

Ralph Beelke (1972), speaking about some of these changes on the occasion of our 25th Anniversary made an extremely important point when he noted that "associations are essentially people," quoting Beelke,

> ...associations are essentially people and that their fates revolve around the dreams, aspirations, and sweat and blood of individuals who work for something in which they believe. The NAEA is a history of individuals who believe in art education and who were willing to give of their time, energy and money to pursue a cause! The years 1958-1962 are years filled with the hopes, dreams, and hard work of many people. p.14

What Beelke was pointing out is that the changes which came about would not have happened without the dreams, aspirations, and sweat and blood of individuals who worked for something in which they believed. This suggests that the constitution which reorganized the five associations into one would not have happened without the hard work and vision of people who served in NAEA leadership roles in those formative years. In particular, I feel credit should be given to at least three of our past presidents, Edward Mattil, who under pressure supported a strong national association, Ralph Beelke, whose personal demeanor inspired the love and respect of all who worked with him and Ivan Johnson, without whose statesmanship the constitution could not have been written.

Similar credit should also be given to the leaders of the regional groups. Considering both the Eastern and Western regionals had been in existence since the 1880's, it was not easy to give up old traditions, ways of thinking, and fond memories of times past just to plow new ground. These regional leaders like those in our National organization also worked for something they believed in.

Change for the regional membership also was not easy. The early NAEA conferences which were convened in the odd numbered years were not that much different in program or in the number attending from the conferences in the Eastern and Western regionals. Regional members saw little difference between the Regional and National years though expecting their officers to serve both the regional and national organizations. It must have truly been difficult for the regional officers in those days to serve both the

members that elected them to preserve the regional and the national organization which expected them to change the regional structure in favor of a strong national.

In the transition years, people on both sides of the unification issue were to test their friendships with one another and their allegiances to older ways of doing things. It would have been easier to serve both sides but everyone knew that could not be.

Mention should also be given to a few other NAEA past presidents who served well in those transition days. Some but not all of those who I feel we are indebted to are: the late Ruth Ebken, who as president, took a very forthright stand against some who would have liked for the NAEA to turn its back on research training. To past presidents, Harlan Hoffa and Bill Lockhart, who kept the faith when our building program seemed doomed, and to Eliot Eisner, who as president-elect, helped firm my decision to go ahead with the financing of our NAEA headquarters building in Reston, Virginia.

In conclusion it can be rightfully noted that these important changes in the NAEA came about because of the post-war changes in american education, the vision and steadfast leadership of the NAEA governance and the loyal support of our membership. During this brief period in our history, we unified five art education organizations into a single national voice in support of art education in the U.S.; we helped expand our vision of art education curriculum in the schools to include study in such areas as Art History, Art Criticism, and Esthetics and we altered our governance structure to become more responsive to the needs of all the NAEA members.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What we have accomplished and this is in my view is considerable, we owe to both these early revisionaries and also to those who have come along since who have helped us stay the course and go on to even greater and more significant accomplishments. This is I guess, not all that surprising when we consider as Beelke noted "that associations are after all people".

1. M. Barkan. (1967) New Directions in Art Education Report of The International Symposium. Washington, D.C., United States Office of Education.

2. L. Bishop. (1970) Report on The Seminar For Improving The Effectiveness of Supervisors in Art Education. Washington, D.C., National Art Education Association.

3. R. Beelke. (1972) Association are people, Art Education, 25 (1).

4. B. J. Davis (Ed.). (1969) Report on The 19th World Congress of INSEA: Washington, D.C. National Art Education Association

5. G. Kensler. (1971) Observation A Technique for Art Educators. Washington, D.C. The National Art Education Association.

6. J. Mahlmann. (1972) Editorial, Art Education, 25 (1).

7. J. Murphy and L. Jones. (1976) Research in Art Education/A Federal Chapter. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare.

8. E. Ziegfield. (1972) Our progress our job revisited, Art Education. 25 (1).